

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-18, 21-34, 36, 37, 38 and 41 were rejected as being anticipated by Burr. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has not cited any support in Burr for the limitation "wherein the system implements an associative write verify during holographic recording." Applicants respectfully submit that Burr fails to disclose this limitation.

Burr discloses a variety of techniques to improve the performance of content-addressable holographic memories being used in the traditional manner. It contemplates modifying the reference beam; organizing the data patterns; and conditioning the correlation signal. All these techniques are purported to improve the correlation signal-to-noise ratio during an associative read or search operation. However, *nowhere* does Burr disclose that its "system implements an associative write verify during holographic recording" as recited in independent claims 1 and 21 of the pending application. The passage in Burr, columns 7-8 discuss performing a correlation for the purpose of calibrating hologram strengths prior to a search operation, rather than as a verification for a write operation. Furthermore, a holographic memory employing the 'Associative Write Verify' technique of Burr does not necessarily even function as a content-addressable memory during read operations.


Claims 19, 20, 39 and 40 were rejected as being obvious over Burr in view of Dhar (U.S. Pat. No. 6,482,551). This rejection is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn because Dhar is not prior art under 35 USC 103 (c).

Dhar is a 102 (e) prior art because it issued after the filing date of the pending application. Also, Dhar is assigned to the same assignee as that of the pending application. Thus, under 35 USC 103 (c), Dhar is not prior art for an obviousness rejection.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 15, 35 and 42-52 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because Applicants believe that the base claims should be allowable in light of this response, Applicants have not amended claims 15, 35 and 42-52 as suggested by the Examiner.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **495812001200**. However, the Assistant Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: December 3, 2003

By:

Raj S. Davé, Ph.D., J.D.  
Registration No. 42,465

Morrison & Foerster LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
Telephone: (703) 760-7700  
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777